

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the previous amendments and the following remarks.

The February 19, 2009 Advisory Action discusses Claims 47-51 as follows:

These claims directed to an invention other than the invention as originally filed as this point of time these claims are subject of restriction and are not allowable because the scope of the original claims are not the same as the new claims (see preamble).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to perform the requisite restriction analysis set forth in Chapter 800 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure. Instead, the Examiner has simply pointed out that the new claims are of different scope than the pending claims. Applicants respectfully submit that this simplistic analysis fails to make even a *prima facie* case that the claims are restrictable. The basis for requiring restriction is unsupported by any factual evidence in the Action and is therefore clearly improper. Applicants respectfully request that the requirement be withdrawn and Claims 47-51 be examined on their merits.

In rejecting Claims 1, 2 and 14-23 for allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement, the Examiner states that the specification fails to disclose that the antenna ends and the pads are electrically connected. Also, in rejecting those claims for allegedly being indefinite, the Examiner states that it is not known whether the antenna ends can be electrically connected to its pad by an insulating bridge. However, the fourth paragraph on page six of the Official Action states that the "insulating bridge 13 is produced by covering the turns of antenna 11 with an insulating layer 14 in a zone Z, then by depositing a conductive element 15 on this insulating layer 14, the conductive element 15 allow[s] the end of one turn... to be

connected to one of the connection pads 12 of the antenna." Applicants respectfully submit that it was notoriously well-known to an ordinarily skilled artisan at the time of the invention that conductors are capable of conducting electricity. It would have been quite clear to an ordinarily skilled artisan that, in the disclosed device, the connection between an antenna end and a pad by the conductive element 14 of the insulating bridge 13 is an electrical connection.

For the above reasons, Claims 1, 2 and 14-23 are enabled and definite, and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1, 2 and 14-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

Claim 1, the only rejected independent claim, is also rejected as being anticipated by Fidalgo.

Claim 1 recites a method for manufacturing smart cards, each having an antenna with ends or connection pads for connection to an electronic module, including producing, on a support sheet, the antenna with at least two turns and a pair of connection pads that are both disposed on a common side of said antenna turns, and electrically connecting at least one of the ends of the antenna to a respective one of the connection pads by means of a bridge disposed on a surface of the turns that is away from said support sheet.

In the rejection, the Examiner identifies Fidalgo's lower thermoplastic sheet 3 as constituting a support sheet, and Fidalgo's contact terminals 15 as constituting connection pads. However, the Examiner also states regarding Fidalgo that "the terminal of antenna 5 electrically connected to contact zone 12 includes pads 10 and 11 of module and further, 10-13 create a bridge like structure". Therefore, it appears that the Examiner actually considers Fidalgo's metal pads 10 and 11 to correspond

to the recited connection pads, and Fidalgo's conductive tape on the lateral faces 13 to correspond to the recited bridge. Should the Examiner's position regarding what Fidalgo discloses differ from the above discussion, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's position be clarified.

In any event, Claim 1 is clearly distinguishable from the disclosure in Fidalgo. Specifically, Claim 1 recites that the bridge is disposed on a surface of the turns that is away from the support sheet. It is quite clear from Fidalgo's Fig. 1 that Fidalgo's conductive tape on the lateral faces 13 is not disposed on a surface of the turns of antenna 5 that is away from the lower thermoplastic sheet 3. Accordingly, Fidalgo does not disclose a bridge disposed on a surface of an antenna's turns that is away from a support sheet, in combination with the other elements recited in Claim 1.

Moreover, Claim 1 is amended to further distinguish the recited method from the disclosure in Fidalgo. Specifically, Claim 1 recites that the pair of connection pads are both disposed on the support sheet. Clearly, Fidalgo's metal pads 10 and 11 are not disposed on the lower thermoplastic sheet 3. If anything, Fidalgo's metal pads 10 and 11 are disposed on the upper thermoplastic sheet 4. Accordingly, Fidalgo does not disclose producing, on a support sheet, an antenna with at least two turns and a pair of connection pads that are both disposed on the support sheet, in combination with the other elements recited in Claim 1.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable over Fidalgo, and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

New independent Claim 52 recites a patentably distinguishable method for making an assembly of sheets including an antenna with two ends and an electronic module, including producing, on a support sheet, the antenna including at least two

turns and a conductive element electrically insulated from the turns and crossing over or under the turns at one of the antenna ends, forming an assembly of sheets including the support sheet, machining a cavity in an upper side of the assembly of sheets, and attaching an electronic module in the cavity, the module having conductor pads in electrical contact with the antenna ends by a conductive coupling element. Allowance of new Claim 52 is respectfully requested.

The dependent claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in the dependent claims is not set forth at this time.

Early and favorable action with respect to this application is respectfully requested.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: February 23, 2009

By: /Peter T. deVore/

Peter T. deVore

Registration No. 60361

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620